



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,250	08/05/2003	Elizabeth DeSchryver	10022/350	7779
28164 7590 09/10/2009 ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164 BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P O BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			EXAMINER PADMANABHAN, KAVITA	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/10/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/634,250

Applicant(s)

DESCHRYVER ET AL.

Examiner

Kavita Padmanabhan

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 and 13-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 13-17 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 6-8 and 13-25 are pending.
2. Claims 18-21 are withdrawn.
3. Claims 6-8, 13-17, and 22-25 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
6. **Claims 6-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Leymann et al.** (US 2002/0026297, hereinafter "Leymann").

In regards to **claim 6**, **Leymann** teaches a method for mapping a knowledge base into a hierarchical framework to facilitate reusability of task objects between related work domains, the method comprising:

defining a set of taxonomies comprising members of a universe of activity objects for a first methodology (**Leymann; par [0011]**);

organizing a set of task objects of singular granularity into object groups having in common a relation to one member of the taxonomy (**Leymann; par [0016], par [0072]**); and

publishing onto an application server for access by a user through an electronic display a plurality of documents having a hierarchical linkage, wherein a highest level document displays the set of taxonomies with links to a set of second level documents, each second level document representing an activity object instantiating a single member of the taxonomy, the second level document having links to a group of third-level documents, each third level document representing a task objects instantiating a single task object of singular granularity (**Leymann; par [0009], Figs. 1, 2, 3B**);

a methodology mapping for a plurality of methodologies, including the first methodology and a second methodology (**Leymann; par [0049], par [0072], par [0080]**); and

mapping, with the methodology mapping, each methodology of the plurality of methodologies to a selection of a set of taxonomies from the user, whereby an instantiation of an activity object from the first methodology may be reused for the second methodology (**Leymann; Fig. 5; par [0049], par [0072], par [0088]**).

Leymann does not expressly teach receiving the methodology mapping selection from the user through the electronic display.

However, since Leymann teaches that the methodology mapping selection may be performed manually by a user (**par [0006] – par [0007], line 2 – mapping done manually**), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to implement the method of Leymann by performing the methodology mapping manually, whereby the methodology mapping selection would be received from the user through the electronic display, in order to give the user more control of the mapping.

In regards to **claim 7**, **Leymann** teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the activity objects are established by defining a first set of taxonomies sharing in common a first characteristic inherent to each member in the first set of taxonomies; and defining a second set of taxonomies sharing in common a second characteristic inherent to each member in the second set of taxonomies; the first set of characteristics being independent of the second set of characteristics; and associating with an activity object one member of the first set of taxonomies and one member of the second set of taxonomies (**Leymann; Fig. 3A; pars [0014]-[0016], par [0049], par [0051], par [0072], par [0088]**).

In regards to **claim 8**, **Leymann** teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the first characteristic is a time sequence, and the second characteristic is a skill set (**Leymann; par [0044], par [0051], par [0057], par [0073]**).

7. **Claims 13-17 and 22-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Leymann in view of Pronsati et al.** (US 6,678,716, hereinafter "Pronsati").

In regards to **claim 13**, **Leymann** teaches every feature, except **Leymann** does not explicitly describe role information.

Pronsati describes role information (**Pronsati; col. 14, lines 40-46**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include roles in **Leymann** to further compartmentalize the processes (**Pronsati; col. 14, lines 40-46**).

In regards to **claims 14 and 15**, **Leymann and Pronsati** teach the method of claim 13, wherein the activities include: Human Resources, Unit Management, Finance and Reporting, Performance Measurement, Process and Quality Management, Service Management, Technology Enablement, and Facilities and Equipment and wherein the activities include: analyzing, designing, building and testing application (**Pronsati; col. 1, lines 27-51; col. 7, lines 46-51**).

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected for similar reasons as provided for claims 13-15, in addition to **Figs. 2, 5, 7, 10, and 18 of Pronsati**.

Claims 22-25 are rejected for similar reasons as provided for claims 13-15, in addition to **Fig. 6, par [0015], par [0016], and the Abstract of Leymann and the Abstract of Pronsati**.

Response to Amendment

8. Applicant's amendments filed 6/2/09 with respect to the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejections have been fully considered. The corresponding rejections have been withdrawn accordingly.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 6/2/09 with respect to the prior art rejections of the claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues at page 10 of applicant's remarks that Leymann does not teach using an activity object to associate one member of a first set of taxonomies and one member of a second set of taxonomies. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Leymann teaches an activity object that is associated with members of multiple taxonomies (par [0049]; par [0051]; par [0088]; Fig. 3A), and thereby clearly associates a member of a first taxonomy with the corresponding member of a second. As an aside, the examiner respectfully notes that a set of taxonomies may consist of a single taxonomy, i.e. a set of one.

Applicant argues at page 11 of applicant's remarks that Leymann does not teach an activity object established by defining a first characteristic that is a time sequence and a second characteristic that is a skill set. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Leymann teaches that one can define a sequence of activities in a process model of a taxonomy (Leymann; par [0051]), which is a time sequence characteristic. Leymann also teaches staff as a component of a process model of a taxonomy (Leymann; par [0044]), which characterizes a skill set.

Applicant's remaining arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kavita Padmanabhan whose telephone number is (571)272-8352. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kavita Padmanabhan
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161

September 8, 2009

/Kavita Padmanabhan/